THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

WRIT PETITION NOs : 28049 of 1995, 552 of 1998, 2314 of 1998, 14839 of 2001 and 14840 of 2001.

Dated 25-07-2005:

WRIT PETITION NO: 28049 of 1995

Between:

1. Saripalli Lakshmikumar reddy and 3 others. .. Petitioners.

And

Andhra Pradesh State Agro Industries Development Corporation Ltd., rep. by its Vice-Chairman and Managing Director, Hyderabad. .. Respondent

WRIT PETITION NOs : 552 of 1998

Gutlapalli Prasad Rao .. Petitioner

And

1. The Government A.P., rep. by its Secretary and 2 others.

.. Respondents.

WRIT PETITION NOs : 2314 of 1998

Between;

–

B.V.Krishna Reddy .. Petitioner

And

1. The Govern;ment; of A.P., rep. by its Secretary and 2 others.

.. Respondents.

WRIT PETITION NOs : 14839 of 2001

–

Between:

M/s.B.V.Krishna Reddy .. Petitioner

And

1. The Government of A.P., rep. by its Secretary and 2 others.

.. Respondents.

WRIT PETITION NOs : 14840 of 2001

–

Between:

Gutlapalli Prasada Rao .. Petitioner

And

1. The Government of A.P., rep. by its Secretary and 2 others.

.. Respondents.

***

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

-

-

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

-

WRIT PETITION NOs : 28049 of 1995, 552 of 1998, 2314 of 1998, 14839 of 2001 and 14840 of 2001.

COMMON ORDER:

The issue arising for consideration in these writ petitions is squarely covered by the decision of this Court rendered in W.P.No.15960 of 1995, dated 23-06-2005. The learned counsel on either side also concede that the issue is squarely covered by the said Judgment.

2. But the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that insofar as the petitioners 2 and 4 in W.P.No.28049 of 1995 are concerned, they need some more consideration. It is his contention that the cases of one P.S.S.Ravi Kumar, K.B.Jaganmohan and G.Rambabu, though they are juniors to the petitioners, their cases have been considered for regularization, whereas the case of these petitioners has not been considered.

3. A counter-affidavit has been filed by the respondents stating that those three persons were appointed as Senior Marketing Officers against backlog vacancies of 1991. Therefore, the petitioners cannot compete with that of those three persons referred to above.

4. Therefore, there is no substance in the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

5. Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are disposed of following the order passed in the Writ Petition No.15960 of 1995, dated 23-06-2005 in the same terms. However, this order will not preclude the petitioners from making a detailed representation, if they have got any other grievance, as to the fixation of salary etc., for the service rendered by them earlier in the organization and the same shall be considered, within a period of two months from the date of

receipt of representation, in accordance with law. No costs.

_____

July 25, 2005

KVR